

# THE CHALLENGE TO WESTERN CIVILIZATION

AN ADDRESS BY

DR. CHARLES MALIK

The following is a compilation of different addresses given by Charles Malik: *Passing to the Offensive*, delivered in June of 1961 at Seattle University, *Some Urgent Tasks*, delivered on October 18, 1961 at the John Carroll Society in Washington, D.C., *Will the Future Redeem the Past*, delivered in June of 1960 at Colonial Williamsburg, and *The Renewal and Doom of Civilization*, delivered in June of 1961 at American University.

# The Challenge to Western Civilization

BY DR. CHARLES MALIK

Charles Habib Malik, Ph.D., LL.D., Sc.D., Litt. D., Phil.D.,H.L.D.: Distinguished Professor of Philosophy at the American University of Beirut, Beirut, Lebanon; former President of the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations; former Chairman of the Commission on Human Rights of the United Nations; former Ambassador of Lebanon to United States; and former University Professor at the American University in Washington. D.C.

Communism started from zero forty-three years ago, and today it rigidly controls one third of mankind and has penetrated and softened up in varying degrees the remaining two thirds: was this phenomenal development inevitable? The victory of Communism in the late forties in China means that the largest compactly homogenous mass of humanity, numbering some six hundred million people, is now the sworn enemy of everything free and Western: was this development inevitable? The Korean War, despite all its heroic exertions, ended in a draw: was this outcome inevitable? In Southeast Asia there has occurred during the last ten years an advance of Communism and a retreat of freedom: was this advance and retreat inevitable? Whereas international Communism was effectively absent from the Middle East ten or fifteen years ago, and in the consideration of Middle Eastern problems Communism was treated as though it did not exist, international Communism enters decisively today into the determination of every Middle Eastern problem: was this development inevitable? Whereas ten or fifteen years ago Communism was effectively absent from Latin America, today it is visibly present: was this development inevitable? The Communist Party, receiving orders directly from Moscow, is certainly more active and influential today in Asia and Africa than ten years ago, and responsible United States officials have said that the Communists have markedly intensified their activity in the United States: was this penetration inevitable?

Backing international Communism as its embodiment and vehicle is the most superbly organized international political party in history, the Communist Party with the most advanced techniques of intellectual, social, economic, and political penetration and subversion ever devised: was the impotence of the West in developing any comparable counterforce inevitable? Backing international Communism materially is the Soviet Union, which appears to common atomic and nuclear weapons in abundance, whereas ten or fifteen years ago the United States had a monopoly of these weapons: was this decline in Western relative strength inevitable?

The visible struggle appears to occur all on this side of the iron and bamboo curtains: in Europe, in the Middle East, in Southeast Asia, in the Far East in Latin America; and when people expect a crisis to break out tomorrow, they do not expect it in Albania or Rumania or Russia or China but in the home of freedom. Freedom then is on the defensive and not Communism: Communism: is it fated that the West should be always on the defensive, always reacting? The West today appears gladly to welcome neutralism in areas in which it would not have countenanced this phenomenon decades ago: is this constant retreat of Western influence inevitable? In the nascent nationalism of Asia and Africa, which is otherwise a natural and good thing, there is an admixture in varying degrees of anti-Westernism, if not pro-Communism that leads to anti-Westernism: was this spread of anti-Westernism as a concomitant of the growth of nationalism inevitable? In the very nations that have attained the dignity of political freedom and independence other dimensions of freedom have been severely curtailed, namely, personal freedom, intellectual freedom, social freedom, spiritual freedom: was this contraction of the domain of freedom inevitable? Communism has been more persistent and effective in presenting to the Asian and African mind a well thought out interpretation of existence, the Marxist-Leninist ideology, than any outlook that has been forthcoming from the West: was this timidity in the articulation of the ideology of freedom inevitable?

The simple fact that the free world has not succeeded in forty years in pushing back the tide of Communism by one inch from where it really got political control leaves the strong impression that we are here dealing with an irresistible and irreversible thrust which will inevitably inherit and transform in its own image all the kingdoms and cultures of the earth: is this creeping tide of Communism completely irreversible? Perhaps the most distressing fact is the self-satisfaction and self-congratulation that prevails in the West; the softness, the laxity, the lack of determination and decisiveness, the general decadence, the uncritical readiness to settle for "peaceful coexistence"; are we then face to face with some ineluctable judgment of fate or God?

In terms of the ultimate world struggle, how are we to assess the net performance of the immediate past? International Communism is today an over-all basis relatively stronger than ten or fifteen years ago, and the free world is relatively weaker; there is a marked over-all advance by the one and a corresponding over-all retreat by the other. In history it is impossible at any moment to work out a neat, final balance sheet, for at no moment “in history” does history come to an end. It all depends then on the future. The future could redeem the past or it could confirm it. But it will redeem nothing unless the question of the inevitability or otherwise of the developments of the immediate past is first squarely and honestly faced. For either you believe that these things were inevitable or you believe that they could have been helped.

If you believe that they were inevitable—the outcome of the struggle in China, in Korea, in Indochina; the Communist penetration of Asia, Africa, the Middle East and Latin America; the absence of any effective counteracting force to the Communist Party; the relative decline in Western influence and Western economic and military strength—that all these developments of the nineteen-fifties *could not have been helped, then you are already a Marxist*. For Marx, Lenin, and Khrushchev hold firmly (and Khrushchev repeats it every day) that the iron laws of history are precisely such that whatever happens, Communism will come out on top. Therefore, to them, and to you, if you believe in the inevitability of these developments (that is, if you refuse to assume moral responsibility for them), the Communist advance and the Western retreat did not come about by accident: the universe was such, history was such, the nature of human society and its development was such, the economic, social, and political situations in Asia, Africa, Europe, and America were such, that the advance and the retreat *had to take place*. I warn you therefore against declining to assume full moral-historical responsibility for what happened during the last two decades; for if you do so you are already a Marxist, and Marxian Communism will have already won in your soul.

The only hope, therefore, is to believe that nothing of what transpired was inevitable and that everything could have been prevented or reversed. Only on the basis of radical moral responsibility can you overcome the fatalism of the cosmologists and the determinism of the dialectical materialists. The future will never redeem the past, and we will only pass from one fiasco to another, from one pathetic drift to another, unless in contemplating the past we can put our finger with certainty on such and such an act and such and such a decision and such and such a person and honestly say that this act or decision or person *could have been different* and therewith the course of events would have taken a radically different turn.

What must be done in the immediate future to reverse the trend of the immediate past? Four conditions are absolutely *sine qua non*: unity among the Western Allies, deeper understanding and statesmanlike assistance toward the peoples of Asia and Africa, winning the technological competition especially in the matter of armaments, and winning the economic competition in productivity. If the Atlantic world breaks up, whether from internal friction or external pressure, there will be complete disarray in the free world and little will be left to oppose effectively the onward march of Communism anywhere. If the Asians and Africans are not understood on the deepest possible level, and if the Communists prove that they are more friendly and helpful to them, then Asia and Africa will gradually fall to their wiles. If the Communists do better in the technological revolution, especially with respect to weapons, then all will be lost. If the West does not outproduce them both quantitatively and qualitatively, then the rest of the world will be sucked into their system.

Nothing is half as important today as that the spiritual unity of Europe, America, and the Mediterranean world be understood and affirmed. By any standard of measurement, the material and human resources of North and South America, of Western Europe, of Japan, of Australasia, and of as much of Africa (and there is no reason why all of Africa should not be included) and Asia as may be persuaded to co-operate can be so marshaled and coordinated as to outdo the Communist domain in any field of human endeavor by a ratio of at least five to one. It is all therefore a question of vision, will, overcoming the softness of life, and inducing the necessary unified effort. The free world has nobody and nothing to blame but itself if it cannot so order its house as to beat the Communists decisively in every realm. The West should stand firm at all costs against any further expansion of Communism. But merely holding the line is patently not enough. This was the error of the doctrine of containment. It is a passive, defensive, unchallenging policy, and such a policy, except as a necessary first step, is doomed to failure; first, because this is a dynamic universe; second, because we are dealing with the most aggressive enemy, who will always swirl around and underneath and above all our containing devices; third, because a merely defensive or containing attitude means we are so lazy and self-satisfied that all we wish is to get away with our own skins, and without vision and concern for the rest of the world, we will sooner or later find that others, including our erstwhile friends, have no concern for us; and fourth, because we cannot be true to our own freedom if we do not wish and work for freedom for others.

It is interesting to note the sort of qualifications that responsible leaders sometimes use for "peace." The Communist spokesmen employ peace without qualification; by which they mean that they should be allowed to carry out their international proletarian revolution "in peace." But the spokesmen of the West speak of peace "with justice and freedom." This is a correct qualification from the Western point of view: peace without justice and freedom is no

peace. But which of the two qualifications do they drop when they wish to use only one? They usually drop freedom and leave justice. This to me is wrong. It could betray an unconscious readiness to sacrifice freedom for what is sentimentally called justice. Both are certainly necessary, but freedom is more fundamental. Freedom creates justice but not conversely; for justice could be something mechanical without the ultimate freedom of the spirit which demands and creates and recognizes and enforces justice. The West can only be true to itself if it says, "I am prepared to settle for peace with freedom and justice," and if it wants to use only one of the two, "I am prepared to settle for peace with freedom."

*It follows that an active policy of liberation is of the essence of any sound Western program for the coming years.* When the late John Foster Dulles spoke of liberation shortly after he became Secretary of State, was there a Communist or fellow-traveling or Olympian or softheaded or pacifist or appeasing voice in the world that did not attack him? This synchronization of all these voices against anyone who would dare stand up and actively challenge Communism is one of the strange phenomena of this age. It measures the success of international Communism in intimidating and softening up the free world.

But only a believing, active, sustained, and bold looking forward to a free Eastern Europe, a free Russia, and free China is worthy of the magnitude of the gigantic world struggle. A radical distinction must be made between the great peoples of these countries and their Communist governments. Policies should be devised and pursued in conformity with this distinction. The flame of freedom must be kept burning in the soul of the oppressed. The hope of liberation must never be allowed to fade away from their hearts. As free peoples they have an honorable and equal place in the company of the free. Their energies will be given the freest scope. Their spiritual and cultural contributions to the whole world are awaited and welcomed. With vision and leadership the West should be able to promise them greater material benefits than they have been able to achieve under Communism; benefits which they themselves would acquire by their own free exertions. But they should be promised much more: they should be assured of the freedom to criticize, the freedom to think, the freedom to create, the freedom to live, the freedom to work, the freedom to choose and turn out their own governments, the freedom to lead on the basis of merit in a world freed of the poison of mistrust, subversion, and intrigue.

The Communists never tire of assuring the rest of the world that "peaceful coexistence" means only that they will realize their unalterable aim of communizing the world without war, and that where they do not succeed in this, they will keep in mind the possibility of non-peaceful means. They are therefore absolutely determined to dominate the world with or

without war. What they are saying behind all this jargon is that the international Communist movement wants to overthrow every existing government, regime, system, outlook, religion, and philosophy, and bring the whole world, all human thought, aspiration, action, and organization under its absolute control. This is their declared, unchanged, and unchanging objective.

I have yet to hear one Western leader who, assured to his face that he is doomed and will be “buried,” can muster enough courage and conviction, if not to use the vulgar phrase “bury” with respect to Communism itself, at least to use some such civilized expression as that the days of Communism are numbered and that Communism will one day be completely forgotten. forgotten. When Mr. Khrushchev assures Western leaders that their children or at most their grandchildren will all be Communist, I have yet to hear one Western leader who assures Mr. Khrushchev with the same gusto that his children or at least his grandchildren will live to regret and be thoroughly ashamed of the fact that their fathers or grandfathers were ever Communist. And whereas international Communism believes and acts the belief that the days of everything non-Communist are numbered, my deepest fear is that Western leadership believes no such thing with respect to Communism. My fear is that the softening-up process has reached such advanced state that all now believe that Communism is here to stay and that therefore the utmost they can do is to manage somehow to “coexist” with it. The deepest crisis of the West is the crisis of faith in its own values. Whereas Communism believes that non-Communist values must be eliminated from the face of the earth, and acts on this belief, the West no longer believes that Communist values themselves are doomed to utter destruction and oblivion and therefore no longer acts on this belief. I am yet to meet or know of one important Western leader who entertains a dynamic vision for the Communist realm which includes the certainty that the children of present-day Communists will have completely repudiated Communism and will have adopted the fundamental values of freedom. Let the West face up to this advanced state of decay in its own soul.



There are five fronts in which it is necessary today to pass to the offensive—the front of Communism, the front of neutralism, the front of those who are engaged in undermining the unity of the Western world, the front of materialism, and the front of what I would term the least common denominator. The center of the first two fronts lies outside the Western world, the center of the last two fronts lies inside the Western world, and the center of the third front exists at once inside and outside.

Morally and spiritually the Communists put you and me on the defensive: they make us feel guilty, and we supinely accept the terms of their debate. They talk in terms of “capitalism,” “imperialism,” “colonialism,” “monopolies,” “profits,” “exploitation,” “means of production” – all purely economic, purely materialistic terms. And how do we engage ourselves in debate with them? We usually answer that the exploiting capitalism of the nineteenth century no longer exists, that imperialism has been liquidated, that monopolies are now owned by the people, and that, as to profits, everybody now shares in them. It is evident that there is about this response a pathetic air of apology, a ring of feebleness, a sickly note of timidity, and those who make it clearly suffer from a guilty conscience. When we thus accept to be drawn into debate with the Communists on their own terms we confirm them in the feeling that they were right; it is as though we were telling them, “You are right in your attack; we are sorry for our past ways; but behold, we have now corrected them.”

This will not do. The Communists should be answered, not apologetically, not as though they were right, but in terms taking them completely off their guard. They should be answered in human, moral, and spiritual terms.

It is most important that the Communists be put on the defensive. It is most important that the total arsenal of political, moral, and spiritual values be brought to bear upon this struggle. Naturally, if we do not believe in the primacy of these political, personal, moral, and spiritual values, we will not bring them up at all, or we will bring them up tongue-in-cheek. But to keep on talking only in their materialistic terms, to accept timidly their universe of discourse, to be constantly on the defensive vis-à-vis their onslaught, is already to have been vanquished by them.

One is not seeking to win a game of words and arguments: it is history and destiny that are at stake. I would certainly settle for losing the argument of words, provided I win the contest of history. The pathos of the situation today is that the argument reflects the contest. It is most important therefore to develop and execute policies and actions that will put the



Communists and their friends historically on the defensive. Those who believe in man and his freedom, who know trust, and who trust in God, the guarantor of all freedom and truth, must therefore pass to the offensive, not only of thought and conviction, but of that real, decisive, historical action that will cause the Communists to take their heels.

Those who, for whatever reason, wish to remain outside the gigantic world struggle between Communism and freedom have every right to expect the rest of the world to respect their freedom.

As a matter of fact, real neutralism, implying real freedom of choice and real independence of judgment, is a triumph for the idea of freedom. The free world can only welcome it.

But a neutralist, rightly asking that his will be respected, has no right himself to impose his will on others. By his own logic, he must not object if others choose not to be neutral in this great struggle. Himself refusing to take a stand, the neutralist must respect those who do. A neutralist who is all the time working to extend the domain of neutralism, especially if this extension happens to be at the expense of only one side, is obviously not neutral.

Nor will one who really wishes to—and can—stay outside the struggle, play one side against the other. A neutralist in that case identifies his interests with the division of the world. He flourishes so long as there is tension; as soon as tension relaxes, he ceases to reap much value from his neutralism. Below a certain degree of tension, and above a certain degree of tension when the pressure increases considerably on the neutralist to take a stand, neutralism ceases to be profitable. *A neutralist, beginning by wanting to serve peace and understanding, could easily develop vested interests in the absence of peace and the absence of understanding.*

Then there is a neutralism that is, in fact, a Communist front. In a life-or-death struggle this kind of neutralism cannot be tolerated.

There are people and forces, inside and outside the Western world, whose effect is to undermine whatever unity there is in that world. I am not thinking of the Communists, whose very purpose is to conspire in that direction. I am thinking of the softheaded, the duped, the tired, the frightened, the sentimental, the superficial, the unauthentic, and the perfectly innocent who mean well. If these people have their way, freedom will finally fall by sheer division and default. An offensive must, therefore, be mounted on this front.

England cannot be separated from Europe. Therefore, determined effort must be made to heal the breach between the so-called inner six and outer seven.

France is an integral pillar of the West, and Western civilization is unthinkable apart from French culture. Therefore, France does not deserve an unequal treatment, and every force that tends to weaken or embitter or humiliate France must be resisted.

Germany must not be so slighted and intrigued against as to begin to think of neutralism as an alternative. Therefore, Berlin must not be abandoned, and those who desire a weak Germany must not prevail.

Japan is vital to every balance in the Far East. Therefore, relations with Japan should be deepened further, in the service of freedom and man.

Latin America must not be allowed to drift towards neutralism and anti-Americanism. Therefore far-reaching measures must be devised and prosecuted with a view to ridding the Western Hemisphere of the Communist virus and promoting the Friendliest relations between Latin and Anglo-Saxon on the basis of their common civilization.

The United States cannot go it alone in the modern world. Therefore isolationism in all its subtle shades should not have the last word, and America should embark on a bold, new policy of developing still more intimate relations with all her friends.

I include many things under the front of materialism: the quest after money and material gain, the all-consuming passion for economic security, greed and covetousness, trusting only our senses and what they deliver. I also include the fundamental spiritual attitude which denies real order in the nature of things, which denies that there is a real objective higher and a real objective lower, which instead derives the higher integrally from the lower, which obliterates the dimension of rank, excellence, quality, depth, and which, therefore, knows no rest, no grace, and no ultimate peace.

But there is a higher and a lower in the nature of things. An animal is higher than a stone, and man is higher than an animal. And in man his moment of understanding is higher than his moment of bodily desire, and perhaps his love is even higher than his understanding.

Nothing is more needed today than a mighty spiritual offensive which will put the material in its place and restore to the spiritual its original primacy and pre-eminence. Man, it seems, can never learn this lesson; he must always invert the right order of values and put the lower things first.

This does not mean that I scorn or spurn or sneer at the wonderful products of industry. On the contrary, I look upon science and industry as among the most important benefactors of mankind and upon their products as among the greatest monuments of the creative mind and spirit of man. And I will always wish and work, not only for me to enjoy the marvelous products of industry but also for others to enjoy them. The concept of economic and social justice is an absolutely valid concept. But he who does not know how man may become so ensnared and infatuated by these things as to lose the original, sharp edge of his soul, has still much to learn.

Those who believe in man and his freedom, who know truth, and who trust in God cannot allow the creative sources of their being to be sapped by softness and materialism. Nor can they rise to the historic demands of the hour in meeting the challenge of Communism, in helping the uncommitted world, and in effecting the needed Western unity, except on the basis of the primacy of the mind and spirit. They must, therefore, rebel against the tyranny of the lower and reinstall the higher on its legitimate throne.

The question of the least common denominator is the distressing phenomenon of people without an enduring backbone. Because diverse points of view in this age are mingling and challenging each other on every turn, people with a weak backbone soon take on the color of those who surround them. Let a Communist meet a man from the free world, and soon the atmosphere is one of class struggle and pure economics.

Men of real backbone will never betray their fundamental convictions. They will never allow other points of view to dull or flatten their souls. They will at least remain silent, and silence often speaks a volume of words. God allows you to see the truth: it is possible to sacrifice yourself for it without asking or expecting anything in return.

In this age of softness, appeasement, and compromise, it is most essential that we pass to the offensive of holding fast to the deepest we know. Nothing is more tragic than that those who believe in man and his freedom, who know truth, and who trust in God should, in the intensity of the challenge, forget their principles or water down their beliefs. When the soul thus loses its integrity, none can respect it any more. Nor can it in the end respect itself.

The law of freedom does not require that all points of view should merge into a blur. All that is necessary is an order of mutual respect. Above all change and compromise, one point of view should remain immovable and grounded as a rock. When darkness lifts, that which is held by the rock will lift all men unto itself. And its immovability will itself cause the darkness to lift.



What is pre-eminently at stake in Mediterranean-Western civilization today is its human and universal elements. It is man who is denied; it is the affirmation that there is nothing that binds and cements all men into one family that is the prime danger; it is the fragmentation of humanity into endless exclusivisms, whether national or cultural or racial or economic, that poses the deepest challenge. Western civilization is doomed until, jolted out of its complacency, self-satisfaction, and sense of apartness, it rediscovers and reaffirms what is genuinely human and universal in its own soul. This means not only economic and technical sharing with Asia, Africa, and Latin America, but intellectual, moral, and spiritual sharing. What is supremely good must be good for all. Those who keep on repeating, as though they discovered a transcendental wisdom, that their ideas, their way of life, their civilization, is “not for export,” but only their industrial products, do not know that they are thereby digging the grave of their civilization and the grave of their way of life.

A civilization in which the human and universal has atrophied can relate itself to others only through force, and force is not an enduring mode of relation, and it can always be broken by force. I am not speaking of diplomacy and propaganda; I am thinking of a whole philosophy of history. I am saying that a civilization is doomed if it is not creatively conscious of something universal and human it can and must give; and I am saying that Western civilization need not be doomed because no civilization conceived and developed the human and universal more than it did.

Most certainly it is not a question of “imposing” anything on anybody; what is genuinely human and universal is never imposed; it is awaited, welcomed, and embraced. What is non-universal in your civilization you keep to yourselves; nobody wants it.

The Communists have a message. It affects the whole of human life. It provides a total interpretation. They are not afraid to say, this is good and that is bad. They are not afraid to shock and challenge the received customs and habits and ideas. They believe in something. The West does not want to shock and challenge; it is civilized; it is afraid lest it offend. Its trouble, therefore, may lie precisely in the fact that the content of its belief is very thin. For that which you really believe to be true and human and universal you will want to share with others; you cannot keep it under a bushel. The question is whether there is a profound part of your being that you honestly feel you must share with others. The question is whether you

honestly feel that you are not complete or happy so long as others are humanly incomplete, that you are not self-sufficient so long as others are miserable or subhuman, a prey to every superstition and every dark fear.

The self-sufficiency of the Anglo-Saxon world, its age-old protectedness by seas and oceans, is its greatest present spiritual trial. It has not needed the rest of humanity. But the world has suddenly become physically one, and minds and ideas are much more critically and instantaneously and perpetually interacting with one another. Only he, therefore, who feels with humanity, who is at one with all conditions of men, who is insufficient and incomplete without them, who is not protected and separated from them, can help them and lead them and love them and be loved by them. The incompleteness of the Communist until he completes himself in others is what gives him the dynamism, the vision, the appeal in the eyes of Asia, Africa, or Latin America.

## IV

The West contains the greatest concentration by far of science, technology, and industry in the world. These things are rooted in a cumulative tradition that extends for thousands of years. They are also self-perpetuating. They represent much more than mere mechanical technique; they represent a fundamental theoretical attitude of a whole culture toward nature, man, history, an attitude that cannot be transplanted to other cultures overnight. With Germany and Japan securely on the Western side, and with science and technology developing as they are in the West, there is no reason to believe that any comparable concentration will arise anywhere else in the world for at least another century. In the space of a century of scientific and technological superiority in which the mind is truly alerted to the ultimate issues of destiny, much indeed can be assured.

This is so far as science and nature and the harnessing of nature's forces are concerned. What about man and culture and history? The dimension of history is now more fully disclosed to the inquiring mind than ever before. And, incidentally, it is the canons of Western scholarship itself that have opened this majestic dimension of the past—not only of the Western past, but of every past. It is almost literally true that the past, in its fundamental structure, is now a completely open book. One need not fear that there is anything important still hidden that will, when uncovered one day, truly astound the world. There will be endless refinements, but the basic contributions are all known. Let every living culture, therefore, display its full achievements. In the total array of cultures and civilizations that

can thus be fathomed, Western civilization, rooted as it is in Greece, Rome, the Near East, the Mediterranean, and Western Europe, stands out as something quite unique. In its unbroken continuity for four thousand years or more, in the creative principles of thought and feeling it established, in the patient disclosure of the mystery of God which it has inherited and which it can never disown, in the incomparable products of beauty and reflection and worship and political wisdom and collective endeavor which it has deposited, it need not feel any sense of inferiority with respect to any other civilization whatsoever. In fact, all other civilizations have learned and continue to learn from it, far more than it has any need to learn from them. This is its distinctive universal and humane character: namely, its preoccupation with truth, the truth that is valid for all, and its concentration upon man as the origin, center, and end of everything. He who, placing himself above any petty political or diplomatic considerations in order to see the truth in itself and for its own sake, penetrates to the depths of achievement of Western civilization, has no doubt whatever about its infinite sources of strength. The only question is whether those of its children who have been initiated into its deepest mysteries are going to prove worthy of what they have received and known.

The total forces of the West have not been fully committed. *This is most important.* Should the occasion arise for the total commitment of these forces, who can predict the outcome? Every time it has happened in the past, the West emerged finally victorious. Let the West as a whole really feel the pinch, and then I doubt whether anything can stand in its way. Having regard to its infinite potentialities of mind, morals, and material and to the creative potency of freedom, I do not have the slightest doubt that the enemies of God, man, and freedom will not have the last word—no matter how much suffering the resistance and destruction of them will entail.

There is a remarkable awakening in America as to the issues and dangers involved. This has never happened before in peacetime. People seem to be ready for any eventuality; they only ask to be told what is expected of them. It is quite possible that in many respects the people are ahead of their leaders. I feel that in a matter of days, if not hours, they could be galvanized into the most heroic action. A civilization that is thus alert and ready cannot be said to be nearing its end.

This raises the question of co-ordination. The greatest danger is unco-ordinated individualism, the frittering away of effort, the non-convergence of energy and interest onto a single point, onto a unitary outcome. People are excited; they sense the danger; they want to join in some common effort; they crave to know what that common effort is; but so far nobody has told them, nobody has summoned them to a supreme effort for the common good. A man demanding that he be shown the way, yet appearing to wait indefinitely without

anybody showing him the way, soon develops a terrible inner frustration. If Western civilization goes down, it will be only because its leadership has failed to show it the way. There is no impersonal law of growth and decay here at work whatsoever. There is the very personal moral failure of the leaders to show the way. *And a real way out most certainly there is.* The actual, ready potentialities of this civilization, in every sphere, are so tremendous, so overpowering, that with the proper co-ordination and the right voice of leadership it can rise to any challenge. The greatest danger today is that either this leadership is not forthcoming or its voice will come too late.